

# COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN POWER TEACHING AND CTL IN INCREASING STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY

Yohanes Agung Pratama, Hery Yufrizal, Sudirman  
yohanes17pratama@gmail.com

**Abstrak.** Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui apakah ada perbedaan yang signifikan dalam pencapaian berbicara siswa yang diajar dengan menggunakan Power Teaching dan CTL. Penelitian ini dilakukan di kelas XI SMAN 10 Bandar Lampung. Hasil pre-test di kelas Power Teaching adalah 65,47, sedangkan di kelas CTL adalah 66,52. Hasil post-test di kelas Power Teaching adalah 76,88, sedangkan di kelas CTL adalah 71,45. Ini berarti bahwa ada perbedaan yang signifikan setelah kedua metode diberikan. Total nilai dalam semua aspek berbicara di kelas Power Teaching adalah 402,5 poin, sedangkan di kelas CTL adalah 129. Ada perbedaan yang signifikan di semua aspek berbicara antara metode Power Teaching dan metode CTL. Ada perbedaan yang signifikan dalam pencapaian berbicara siswa antara siswa yang diajar melalui Power Teaching dan mereka diajarkan melalui CTL.

The objectives of this research were to find out whether there is significant differences in students' speaking achievement who are taught by using Power Teaching and CTL and to find out whether there is aspect of two techniques mostly affect. The research was conducted at the eleventh grade of SMAN 10 Bandar Lampung. The result of pre-test in Power Teaching class was 65.47, while in CTL class was 66.52. The result of post-test in Power Teaching class was 76.88, while in CTL class was 71.45. It means that there was significant difference after treatments were given. The total gain in all aspects of speaking of Power Teaching was 402.5 points, while in CTL was 129. It means that there was significant difference in all aspects of speaking between Power Teaching and CTL method. There was a significant difference of students' speaking achievement between the students who were taught through Power Teaching and those taught through CTL.

**Keywords:** CTL, power teaching, speaking ability

## INTRODUCTION

Speaking is an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing and receiving and processing information. Students can deliver their ideas by speaking. There are three kinds of speaking situations in which we find ourselves. First, interactive, second, partially interactive, and last, non-interactive. Interactive speaking situations include face-to-face conversations and telephone calls, in which we are alternately listening and speaking, and in which we have a chance to ask for clarification, repetition, or slower speech from our conversation partner. Some speaking situations are partially interactive, such as when giving a speech to a live audience, where the convention is that the audience does not interrupt the speech. The speaker nevertheless can see the audience and judge from the expressions on their faces and body language whether or not he or she is being understood. The students have their own difficulties in learning the language. Particularly in improving speaking skill is not easy for the students. The Following are the problems of speaking skill (Munjayanah, 2004: 17):

### a) Inhibition

Unlike reading, writing or listening activities, speaking requires some degree of real-time exposure to an audience. Learners are often inhibited about trying to say thing in foreign language in the classroom: worried about mistakes or simply shy of the attention that their speech attract.

b) Nothing to say

Even they are not inhibited, you often hear learners complain that they cannot think of anything to say. They have no motive to express themselves beyond the guilty feeling that they should be speaking.

c) Low or uneven participation

Only one participant can talk at a time if he or she is to be heard; and in large group this means the each one will have only very little talking time. This problem is compounded of some learners to dominate, while other speaks very little or not at all.

d) Mother tongue use

It is easier for the student to use their mother tongue in their class because it looks naturally. Therefore, most of the students are not disciplined in using the target language in the learning process.

There are two ways to encourage students to overcome their problem. The first one is a way for the teacher to do. It is considered necessary for the teacher to force the students only to speak English during the class. The teacher may fine the students every time they speak their native language. The second solution is for the students themselves. They can have an English conversation club that consists of their own classmates. They can share and talk about anything in English during that time. In this club, they can learn together. Students can correct each other without feeling embarrassed. English will become students' routine by doing that activity (Hetrakul, 1995).

In this research, the researcher compared two methods in two classes to find out the most effective method in increasing speaking skill because the students' speaking ability is too low. The problem is not only from themselves, but also from the way how teacher teach them. There is no time for them to say or ask something in English class because there is no appropriate method used by the teacher in learning process. From this reasons, the researcher conducted Power Teaching and Contextual Teaching and Learning (CTL) as a method for increasing their participation in speaking class. Power Teaching is a method that can increase students' speaking skill in learning English. This method is more effective to increase students' participation in speaking, because this method uses some steps to increase their self confident to speak English. While CTL is also a method that can increase students' speaking skill. Contextual teaching and learning is a conception of teaching and learning that helps teachers relate subject matter content to real world situations; and motivates students to make connections between knowledge and its applications to their lives as family members, citizens, and workers and engage in the hard work that learning requires." (Berns, 2001). The differences both methods are just from the steps that will use in learning process. By conducting this research, the researcher hopes to make an effective method that can be used by the teacher in order to help students increase their speaking ability in the class.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher is interested in finding out whether there is significant differences in students' speaking achievement who are taught

by using Power Teaching and CTL and to find out whether there is aspect of two techniques mostly affect.

## **METHODS**

In this research, the researcher compared Power Teaching and CTL method increase students' speaking ability. By comparing these methods, the researcher wanted to find out which one was better between power teaching and CTL method to increase students' achievement in learning speaking and also what the problems were faced by the students in learning speaking through these methods. The researcher chose two classes in senior high school for conducting the research. Both classes were experimental classes, and were given a pre-test of speaking, and the classes were given a treatment. One class was taught using Power Teaching method and another class using CTL method.

The researcher used quantitative method to analyse the result of the research. Quantitative method was used to analyse the result of students' speaking achievement. The researcher used two groups pre test and post test designs because the researcher wanted to investigate which one between these two methods had more effective result for students' achievement in learning speaking.

The research design of two group pre-test and post-test designs is illustrated as follows:

<b>G<sub>1</sub></b>	<b>T<sub>1</sub> X<sub>1</sub> T<sub>2</sub></b>
<b>G<sub>2</sub></b>	<b>T<sub>1</sub> X<sub>2</sub> T<sub>2</sub></b>

Where,

$G_1$  : group or class 1

$G_2$  : group or class 2

$T_1$  : pre-test for students' speaking achievement before treatment is given

$T_2$  : post-test for students' speaking achievement after treatment is given

$X_1$  : power teaching method

$X_2$  : CTL method

(Setiyadi, 2006)

There were two variables in this research i.e. dependent variable and independent variable. The dependent variable is students' speaking skill. The independent variables are two methods that were used as treatment in teaching speaking for the students. The samples of the research were XI IPA 2 and XI IPA 4 at SMAN 10 Bandar Lampung. The data was about the students' speaking achievement which can be used to identify which one is better between power teaching and CTL method.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This research was conducted to find out whether there is significant difference of students' speaking achievement between two groups of students who were taught through Power Teaching and those who were taught through Contextual Teaching and Learning. The samples of this research were the eleventh grade with the subjects being students of classes XI IPA 2 and XI IPA 4 of the year 2014/2014. The researcher took two classes from nine classes. XI IPA 2 was taken as an experimental class 1, and XI IPA 4 as an experimental class 2. In choosing the sample, the researcher tried out the instrument firstly. Secondly, he analyzed the result and rearranged the instrument for pretest. Then, he administered pretest for the experimental class 1 and experimental class 2. After that, the researcher

conducted the treatments and the last he administered the posttest. To know whether the objectives of the research could be achieved or not, the researcher conducted Power Teaching in the experimental class 1, and Contextual Teaching and Learning in the experimental class 2. The test result of pretest and posttest were then analyzed.

From the result of pretest in Power Teaching class, the total score was 2357; mean score 65.4722; average score 65.46; median score 64.50; the highest score 77.50; and the lowest score 57.50 (see appendix 7). Meanwhile, in the experimental class two the following figures were obtained: total score was 2395; mean score 66.5278; average score 66.52; median score 67.50; the highest score 76; and the lowest score 58.50 (see appendix 9). It was revealed that the experimental class' I total score was smaller than the experimental class' II, but of small difference. The result and the distribution of students' were shown on Appendix 7 and 9.

After conducting the pre-test for both classes, equality in students' basic ability was measured. Measurement was carried out using T-test through SPSS 16 version, in which the hypotheses for the equalization of variance test are:

$H_0$ = There is no significant difference in the level of ability (equal)

$H_1$ = There is a significant difference in the level of ability (equal)

In this case, the criterion for the hypothesis was:  $H_0$  is accepted if  $\text{sign} > \alpha$ . Here, level of significance 0.05 was used.

After giving treatments for three times to students, the post test was administered to know whether there was significant difference of students' Power Teaching

achievement. The post-test was narrative text. From the result, the different achievement also could be seen. In the experimental class 1, the total score was 2768 (see appendix 7).

The mean of post-test for Power Teaching result was 76.8889. The minimum score in pre-test was 69.50 and the maximum score is 86.00 with standard deviation 3.69. It means that there was significant difference after treatments were given. While in CTL class the result shows 71.45. The minimum score in pre-test was 64.50 and the maximum score is 80.50 with standard deviation 3.02. It means that there is significant difference after treatments were given.

**Table 1.1. Gains of Power Teaching and CTL**

<b>The Gain of Power Teaching</b>		
Posttest	Pretest	Gain
76,88	65,46	11,42
<b>The Gain of CTL</b>		
Posttest	Pretest	Gain
71,45	66,52	4,93

The table shows the gain of Power Teaching and CTL methods. The score of posttest in Power Teaching is 76,88 and the score of pretest is 65,56. So the gain between posttest and pretest in Power Teaching is 11,42. While the score of posttest in CTL is 71,45 and the score of pretest is 66,52. So the gain between posttest and pretest is 4,93.



**Table 2.1. Gain between Power Teaching and CTL on Aspect of Speaking****a.**

<b>Aspects of Speaking of PT Gain (Posttest-Pretest)</b>	
Pronunciation	61,5
Fluency	109,5
Vocabulary	99,5
Grammar	57
Comprehension	75

The table shows the gain of aspects of speaking in Power Teaching. There is significant difference in all aspects of speaking between pretest and posttest.

**b.**

<b>Aspects of Speaking of CTL Gain (Posttest-Pretest)</b>	
Pronunciation	8,5
Fluency	27
Vocabulary	77,5
Grammar	16
Comprehension	58

The table shows the gain of aspects of speaking in CTL. The significant difference can be seen in vocabulary and comprehension aspect. There is no significant difference in pronunciation, fluency, and grammar.

Reffering to the research result, it was found that the students who were taught through Power Teaching could achieve higher result than those taught through CTL. There is significant difference between students who were taught through Power Teaching and those taught using CTL. The significant difference can be

seen from the average score between the pre-test and post-test. It can be happened because Power Teaching made learning interesting and enjoyable so that they speak clearly with high self confident. The students had learned gave good impression to them encouraged their motivation and could be better preserved in their mind. It could be seen from their enthusiasms when the students spoke with their friend using Power Teaching.

Pre-test result indicates that some students had low confident in speaking. For example, the scores in experimental class I and II showed that they had low score in pretest. The test in the experimental class I showed total score of 2357; mean score 65.4722; average score 65.46; median score 64.50; the highest score 77.50; and the lowest score 57.50. There were 3 students who got 57-59 due to the fact in posttest scores that they were not able to speak well in front of the class or in front of their teacher because of low self confident, grammar, and vocabulary. Meanwhile, in the experimental class II, the following figures were obtained: total score was 2395; mean score 66.5278; average score 66.52; median score 67.50; the highest score 76; and the lowest score 58.50 (see appendix 9).

It was revealed that the experimental class' II total scores was higher than experimental class I, but of small difference. The example of students' ability before treatment is given. The computation of T-test showed that the two groups had the same problem in speaking before the treatment is given by the researcher. In other words, the two classes fulfilled the criteria of equality level and the research could be conducted to both classes. Their pronunciation and

comprehension use were good enough but in vocabulary, fluency, and grammar still made some mistakes.

Form the data (see appendix 8 and 10) both raters gave the high point for students in pronunciation and comprehension but the other aspects, the rater gave the small point. As mentioned in the previous theory, the primary problem of the students in speaking skill. The fact above is also supported by the result of the pre-test done by the researcher when he conducted the research at the eleventh grade of SMAN 10 Bandar Lampung. The teacher gave the result of students' speaking achievement to the researcher and analyzed the problem faced by the students in speaking.

In the first treatment in experimental class I, the students seemed to be intertested in speaking through Power Teaching technique. Battle (2009) states that power teaching is the technique called as brain-based learning teaching method. Brain-based learning is also the application of meaningful group of principles that represent our understanding of how our brain works in the context of education. This method can integrate an effective classroom management system with learning approaches that tap the way your brain learns best. This approach is amazingly effective and fun with for both the researcher and the students. This method is very new for the students in the class. All students became enjoy to speak when the researcher use this method. Most students spoke fluently without low self confident to their friends. They followed the teacher's instruction. It could be seen from their enthusiasm when they were speaking through Power

Teaching. The students can express their feeling through Power Teaching. In the second and third treatments, students more enjoy to speak through this method. While in the experimental class II, the students showed their interested in speaking class through CTL but in the second and third treatments got the difficulties in teaching. The students did not feel interested anymore in the learning process. As a explanation before, the disadvantage of using CTL is teachers are more intensive in the lead. Teachers no longer serve as a canter of information. The task is to manage the classroom teacher as a team that works together to discover new knowledge and skills for students. They will be confused by it for example: when they were assigned to having conducted the research, the researcher found that the students still get difficulties in elaborate the topic based on their own idea, meanwhile the topics has been applied. They will be confused about it, since they can not express what they want to say.

After the treatment was given by the researcher, the students enjoy to speak with their friends in the class, specially in experimental class I. The researcher gave a topic for students and gave them the score after the treatment was given. To know the increase of students' skill in speaking.

According to the explanation above, the students' score for each aspects of speaking, that are pronunciation, fluency, grammar, vocabulary, and comprehensinility increased significantly from the pretest. In brief, the indicator of the researcher for the students' speaking can be fulfilled in the posttest, so the implementation of Power Teaching improves the students' speaking ability.

According to the explanation above, the students' score for each aspects of speaking, that are pronunciation, fluency, grammar, vocabulary, and comprehensibility are increase but not significantly from the pretest. Comparing with Power Teaching class, the students' scores is not higher than Power Teaching scores. The score of Power Teaching in experimental class 1 is better than the score of CTL in experimental class II.

Power Teaching combines direct instruction, sharing, and immediate feedback to become a new style of teaching. Battle (2009) states that power teaching is the technique called as brain-based learning teaching method. Brain-based learning is also the application of meaningful group of principles that represent our understanding of how our brain works in the context of education. This method can integrate an effective classroom management system with learning approaches that tap the way your brain learns best. This approach is amazingly effective and fun with for both the researcher and the students. In this result, the students easy to speak because they felt enjoy and fun. The way the teacher or the researcher brought the class in enjoy condition made students easy to say something without any serious problems.

In line with the finding described above, it is apparent that learning speaking through Power Teaching gave a significant difference to the students' speaking achievement. In learning speaking, students have to built their self confident. They can speak well if the class give them a pleasant class with some creative steps from teacher to lead them to speak unstressed. Inverse of Power Teaching method, CTL lead students to be more serious (Johnson, 2002). They have to create and speak based on their own knowledge. The students who have a low

vocabulary will be threatened in CTL class and they will just quiet in the class. although, there might be some factors or weaknesses of this research that might have influenced the result of the study.

## CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of the data analysis and discussion, the researcher concludes that there is a significant difference of students' speaking achievement between the students who are taught through Power Teaching and those taught through CTL, as seen from the result of the hypothesis which shows that the value of two tails significance is smaller than alpha (  $\text{sign} < \alpha$ ,  $0.000 < 0.05$ ). The students who are taught by Power Teaching got higher result than those are taught by CTL. It means that Power Teaching is more effective for teaching speaking than CTL. The students in experimental class I got the better result in all aspects of speaking than the students in experimental class II. The gain in all aspects of speaking (pronunciation, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension and grammar) are increase in both classes but the experimental class I got the higher result than the experimental class II.

In order to create conducive atmosphere, the teacher should manage the class well. Usually the class environment becomes noisy or even the class becomes silent because the students tended to be confused or they were busy with their own partners. To minimize this problem, the instructor needs to choose the leader of the group. The leader of the group should make a note based on their friends' activities in learning process then report it to the teacher. So, the teacher easy to control the students' activities in the class.

Then, Since the students have the lowest score in production, it is necessary for the teacher to improve their students' pronunciation, fluency, and vocabulary by doing some activities in the class, such as pronunciation drill or remedial exercises.

## REFERENCES

- Battle. 2009. *The Big 6: Class-Yes!*. (online), (<http://classroompower.com/power-teaching-your-first-steps/the-big-six/power-teaching-the-big-6-1-class-yes/>, retrieved on June 1, 2009).
- Berns, A., & Joyce, H. (2001). *Focus on Speaking*. Sydney: National Center for English Language Teaching and Research.
- Hetrakul. 1995. *The Second Language*. Jakarta. Bumi Aksara.
- Johnson. 2002. *Contextual Teaching and Learning. What it is and why it's here to stay*. California: Corwin Press. Inc
- Munjayanah. 2004. *The Implementation of Communicative Language*. Jakarta. Bumi Aksara.
- Setiyadi, Ag. B. 2006. *Metode Penelitian Untuk Pengajaran Bahasa Asing: Pendekatan Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.